

Friends Bulletin

PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

VOL. 33, NO. 7

APRIL, 1965

STRANGERS UNTO THE VOICE

*The 1964 Pacific Yearly Meeting Lecture
by Mildred Binns Young*

As I travel about now and then among Friends Meetings, the concern I hear oftenest mentioned, the question speakers seem oftenest asked to address themselves to, is: What can we do to deepen the spiritual life of our Meetings? How can we combat a creeping secularity that affects the whole tone of our lives and our communication with other lives? Why is it that Quaker lives no longer seem to deliver any powerful message? — not to those multitudes now engaged in a fierce struggle to obtain their equal share of access to whatever good our civilization has to offer — not to those multitudes who still believe that security lies in being stronger than one's fellows — not to those layers of society who are content to live in easy affluence while destitution still exists in wide areas of even our own country, and much more widely in many other countries. Why do Quaker lives no longer seem to deliver any compelling message even to our own children?

The answer that is more and more clear to me is a hard one, hard to admit, harder to meet in any transforming way. It is, briefly and baldly, that with all our concerns and useful works, our first object remains our own success, success in society as it exists. We strive for it ourselves, we educate our young for it. We may, and we do, criticize and analyze and propose remedies and try to apply them, but on the whole we go along. We want, and generally get, the prizes of a world that we know, and that we say, is on the wrong road. Our faith, that each man of us is connected to God and to all his fellows by something in us that is the very stuff of God, sounds a "different drum" from that of the world. But how many of us march to that "different drum"?

Like any other split between knowing and doing, this dichotomy takes its toll of our inward lives. You cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. You cannot — you really cannot — serve God and mammon.

Last spring we had an illustration of the anomalous position into which the Society of Friends has lived itself after 300 years of its existence. Racial conflict on a large scale broke out in Chester, Pennsylvania, an industrial town in the midst of an area with possibly more

Friends Meetings than any other area of the same size in the world. Yet Friends, though many were deeply concerned and some acted positively, were in the main thoroughly confused about where to set their hands to the situation. Why?

For one thing, we have very little status with the Negro group. The very things about us that would give us some influence in high places — our respectability, our reputation for conservatism, the solidity of our institutions — cut us off from the confidence of the minority group that is demanding change. Here and there are individual Friends (not a few) and committees who have been active with Negroes for years and who have close friends among them, but these relationships are likely to be with academic and professional Negroes, who themselves are almost as uncertain as Friends are, how to participate constructively in the present civil rights revolution.

All over the country recently, such challenges have been confronted and to some extent met; yet nothing is clearer than that all of us waited too long, and that we bring too little clarity to what had long been a crying need. And this is not the only crying need that has been staring us in the face for a long time. What is it that we are so busy about that we do not have time to be aware?

Psalm 106, a long Psalm that reviews the experience of the Children of Israel in the wilderness, says at verse 12:

... they believed [God's] words and sang praise unto him. But within a while they forgot his works, and would not abide his counsel. But lust came upon them in the wilderness and they tempted God in the desert. And he gave them their desire and sent leanness withal into their soul.

The Revised Standard Version puts it: "He gave them what they asked but sent a wasting disease among them."

John Woolman felt the creeping encroachment of this "wasting disease" upon the Society of Friends back in 1772, and almost his last words addressed to his fellow-Friends called on them to be aware of it and to resist it:

... people may grow expert in Business, wise in the Wisdom of this World, retain a fair Reputation among Men, and yet being strangers unto the Voice of Christ, ... the Treasures thus gotten may be like Snares to

FRIENDS BULLETIN
1616 Tenth Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122
Virginia B. Harris, Editor

VOL. 33, NO. 7

APRIL, 1965

The official organ of news and opinion of Pacific Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. Published monthly, except bi-monthly in January-February and July-August.

Second-class postage paid at San Francisco, California.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.50 per year. Monthly Meetings are encouraged to collect or subscribe for all their members and interested attenders. Contributions beyond the subscription price are welcome, to help offset actual costs and reduce Yearly Meeting subsidy. Receipts will be sent on request.

ADVERTISEMENTS: Classified-style advertisements, subject to approval of contents, may be inserted at five cents per word.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Please notify the Bulletin four weeks in advance of your new address, so that you will continue to receive it promptly.

DEADLINE for all copy: 15th of the month preceding issue, except: 1st of September, January, and July.

ALL CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the above address.

**PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING
OFFICERS**

Clerk: Edwin Morgenroth, 2721 Fifth Avenue, Corona del Mar, California

Assistant Clerk: Francis Dart, 2635 Emerald, Eugene, Oregon

Recording Clerk: Walt Raitt, 7919 Misty Lane, Stockton, California 95207

Statistical Secretary: Mildred Burck, 5821 N. Vineyard Drive, Corvallis, Oregon

Treasurer: Robert Young, 234 E. Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, California

Young Friends Clerk: Joyce Victor, 1462 — 38th Ave., Seattle, Washington 98122

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Bulletin: Madge T. Seaver, 1191 Stanyan Street, San Francisco, California 94117

Discipline: Ferner Nuhn, 420 W. 8th, Claremont, Calif.

Education: Gerri House, 2247 Garfias Drive, Pasadena, California

Finance: Paton Crouse, 1238 — 111th NE, Bellevue, Washington

Friends in the Orient: Reginald Price, 1358 — 40th St., Sacramento 19, California

History: Caroline Estes, 2917 Ashby, Berkeley 5, Cal.

Ministry and Oversight: Catherine Bruner, 1603 Woodland, Stockton, Calif. 95207

Nominating: Leonard Dart, 421 W. 8th, Claremont, Cal.

Peace: James Estes, 2917 Ashby, Berkeley 5, Calif.

Social Order: Cecil Thomas, 962 Ordway Street, Albany 6, California

Visitation: Gretchen Rudnick, 405 Vincente Way, La Jolla, California

1965 YEARLY MEETING: August 15-19, 1965, St. Mary's College, Moraga, California.

the Feet of their Posterity. . . . In the Obedience of Faith we die to the narrowness of self-love, and our Life being hid with Christ in God, our Hearts are enlarg'd toward Mankind universally, but in departing from the true Light of Life many, in striving to get Treasures, have stumbled upon the dark Mountains.¹

There had been a time when Friends had not, in Blake's words, "stood silent and busied in their families. . . . [and seen] no visions in the darksome air."² Toynbee³ used the Society of Friends as his example for the 17th century of the role of an "internal proletariat" in producing social change. He defines the "internal proletariat" as any group that is "in but not of" the existing society, producing its wealth by their labor or skill or brains, but not reaping its rewards. Toynbee divides these into the violent proletariats, which have made the historic revolutions, and the gentle ones which, unless they simply succumbed, have procured society's evolutions.

. . . the Society of Friends for a time looked as though it might play in the Western World the classic role of the Primitive Christian Church on whose spirit and practice they devoutly modelled their lives. But, while the Friends have never fallen away from the rule of gentleness, they have long travelled right out of the proletarian path, and have been, in a sense, the victims of their own virtues. It may even be said that they achieved material prosperity in their own despite; for much of their success can be traced to formidable decisions which they have taken, not for profit, but at the bidding of conscience. . . . they migrated from the country to the towns, not because they were tempted by the lure of urban profits, but because this seemed the most obvious way of reconciling a conscientious objection to the payment of tithes to the Episcopalian Church with an equally conscientious objection to resisting the tithe-collectors by force.

Thereafter when Quaker brewers took to making cocoa because they disapproved of intoxicants and when Quaker retail shopkeepers took to marking their goods with fixed prices because they scrupled to vary their prices in the "haggling of the market" they were deliberately risking their fortunes for their faith. But in the event they merely illustrated the truth of the proverb that "honesty is the best policy" and the beatitude that "the meek shall inherit the earth"; and by the same token they removed their faith from the list of proletarian religions.⁴

Toynbee might also have mentioned that because, as religious dissenters, they were debarred from the universities, Friends turned to trade rather than professions, and then to finance, so that some of the great banking houses of England presently had Quaker names, and still do. Also, their testimony against the arts, which were in rather a debased phase during the 17th century, turned Friends to the sciences, so that it has been noted that by the 19th century, a Friend was forty-six times as likely to be a member of the Royal Society as an Anglican was.

We need not reproach our spiritual ancestors for these successes. There was nobody who could stand somewhere and look forward and back in time and perceive that all this success would disarm Quakerism of its creative resistance, so that Friends would oftener be thought of as the cream of the culture than as a proletariat persistently pressing from within for needed changes. Nobody could have guessed that those who lay in jails, or lost all their goods for a testimony against tithe-paying or hat-honor, were paving the way for spiritual descendants who would be slow to accuse an economy of which they were beneficiaries, and too comfortable to criticize a social order in which they had made themselves at home.

Quaker thought centers in a radical theology that claims that some part of every man is of God. This makes every man infinitely precious but also infinitely responsible. Both halves of that affirmation are negated by our existing social condition and even by the most prized Quaker institutions. Existing conditions in society at large may be accidental, but our Quaker institutions are the fruit of intention. We have *intended* our homes to be above average; we have *intended* our schools, our meeting-houses, and our old people's homes to conform to the upper status we have adjusted ourselves to occupying. We make ourselves feel it is a duty to keep these institutions beautiful, comfortable, and efficient.

I wonder how each of us would define testimony as understood by Friends today. Could we truly say, as Braithwaite did of the first Friends:

*The Friend had a life within him to wait on and to obey, not chiefly a creed to believe; and it was this life which developed in the Quaker groups a common body of truths to which they sought to bear unflinching witness. Accordingly, they accumulated "Testimonies" rather than Articles of Faith; and these were not at first thought of apart from the living experience behind them, which was the source of their authority. They represented a particular application of Truth expressed in life, not necessarily the final or perfect Truth.*⁵

Do we not rather think of testimony as a sort of placard we hang out to advertise what we think Friends ought to stand for, while behind the placard we find it possible to carry on business much as it is carried on in the next door shops?

It is typical of our present frame of mind to say (especially as to the Peace Testimony) as I saw it said lately, "We see that our traditional 'No' to war has become almost irrelevant and that our witness must be more than mere statements of our personal position."⁶ The author is quick to add that of course the personal witness too is necessary. But is witness anything at all unless it is personal witness? Corporate witness is hollow (one might call it "a mere statement of our [official] position") unless it is not only carried out by individuals working together, but is also the outward and visible effect of an inwardly-working experience which shapes the whole way of life of the cooperating individuals. A secular writer, a literary critic, and no Quaker, has said: "If [the visionary] thinks poverty a social evil, he is not inconsistent if he remains poor in order to say so."⁷

One socialist leader between the two World Wars lived in great luxury in a hilltop mansion while he strove to advance the Socialist cause, and preached equality for all. He declared that he would gladly give up all his privilege as soon as Socialism was accomplished. But a greater Socialist, Eugene Debs, who spent his life in poverty and prison, said: "While there is a lower class, I am in it; while there is a criminal class, I am of it; while there is a soul in prison, I am not free."

Or there was Joseph Hoag, a Quaker minister who argued long with a General at Knoxville in 1812, as to whether Christian people could resort to the method of war to protect themselves. One of the bystanders said to Joseph Hoag: "Well, stranger, if all the world was of your mind, I would turn and follow after." To which Hoag rejoined: "Then thou hast a mind to be the last man in the world to be good. I have a mind to be one of the first, and set the rest an example."⁸

If testimony is the expression of living experience, the implement of compelling conviction, it has to begin by being individual. The corporate witness cannot exist at all without the individual witness, though the individual can still exist without the corporate.

The article referred to goes on to say: "Our personal witness...remains unshakable." It may be unshakable as far as it goes, but how far does the Quaker "No" to war go? It goes as far as the refusal of some percentage of our young men to accept military service; as far as our supporting several organizations whose purpose

is to educate and legislate against militarism as a national philosophy; as far as relief of suffering caused by wars. Except with a very few Friends, it does not go as far as refusing the taxes which pay for war; nor as far as refusing to profit by businesses and professions that are entangled with war production; nor as far as renouncing a standard of living that our country achieves and keeps by exploitation of weak countries and by exploitation of American fear of strong countries. In fact, our "No" does not go far enough to cause much inconvenience to the warmaking branch of our fellow-countrymen.

Probably the most impressive example to date of non-violent direct action — conscientious no-saying — that changed the face of the society in which it was exerted, was seen in the period between 1650 and 1690 when the first generation Friends won the struggle for religious freedom for the Anglo-Saxon world. At the beginning of the period, a great Presbyterian divine could say that he would renounce religious freedom for himself rather than agree that it was healthful for all men. Scarcely anyone belonging to the religious establishment of England, either when it was Puritan under Cromwell, or later when it was again Anglican, would have differed with him on this point. Yet in less than fifty years, religious freedom was won for England, by the Act of Toleration of 1689. There remained some disabling laws, such as the Test Acts and tithe laws, but in the main the struggle was over. No doubt, all the blood of the martyrs from the stoning of Stephen to the fires of Smithfield had fertilized the soil of England for toleration. But it was Friends who frustrated the last powerful efforts of the British government to stamp out dissent. They did it by devoted, even reckless, individual action springing out of living experience. George Fox and his companions gathered together thousands of persons who believed that there is in every man some portion which is of God, that God has come to teach his people himself, that there is direct access to God available to every human being. These thousands were convinced that, by waiting in attentive and expectant silence together, they could exercise the divine-human privilege of access, and help each other to exercise it.

For twenty-five years before the Act of Toleration, English dissenters suffered under laws prohibiting more than five persons meeting for worship not conducted according to the Anglican liturgy. Penalties were imprisonment, deportation, and financial ruin. Baptists and Catholics and others adapted themselves: they met secretly, or divided up into tiny groups; or they posted sentinels to warn them of approaching officers of the law; or they devised false fronts to disguise the religious nature of their

meetings. Friends, on the contrary, regularly, persistently, and in large congregations, defied the laws by openly meeting at their usual times and places. The soldiers came with clubs and swords and took them to prison in droves. About 20,000 went to prison and about 400 deaths occurred either in prison or soon after, as a result. Pepys wrote in his Diary that he wished the Quakers would either comply with the law, or be cleverer, and "not get caught."

Milton's biographer, David Masson, has left us a classic account:

No denomination so amazed and perplexed the authorities by their obstinacy as the Quakers.... In a meeting of [other sects] there is always some implement or set of implements upon which all depends, be it the liturgy, the gown or surplice, the Bible or the hourglass; remove these and make noise enough and there can be no service. Not so with a Quaker meeting. There, men and women worship with their hearts, without implements, in silence as well as by speech. You may break in upon them, hoot at them, roar at them, drag them about; the meeting, if it is of any size, essentially still goes on until all the component individuals are murdered. Throw them out at the doors... and they but re-enter at window and quietly resume their places. Pull their meeting-house down, and they re-assemble next day most punctually amid the broken walls and rafters.... By their peculiar method and open violation of the law and passive resistance only, they rendered a service to the common cause of all the Non-conformist sects which has never been sufficiently acknowledged.⁹

At the same time, Friends were persistently sending their representatives and their written appeals to King and Parliament. But while they were doing everything in their power to alter the laws that infringed on their consciences, they were quietly and steadily refusing to comply with such laws. They put what they conceived to be their duty to God ahead of their duty to their families, their property, or their own persons. As someone was to say, these Friends were controlled by principles, not by consequences. And they were effective, as Friends have never been effective in the same degree again. Their testimony was not superimposed on Quaker lives. It grew root and branch out of their lives. If they were to live at all, they had to live in freedom to worship God, so they staked their lives and the future of their young movement in the struggle for freedom.

I venture to think that the rapid and drastic change that took place in the public mind during this fifty-year period, with respect to religious

freedom, is equalled only by the rapid changes in attitude toward racial difference that we see proceeding all over the world today.

Before this struggle ended, numbers of Friends had already emigrated to Pennsylvania where they had liberty to make a "holy experiment" in government. "Their aim was not primarily the improvement of individual fortunes but the establishment of a society penetrated by religious values and firmly controlled in the interests of the community."¹⁰

But within a few years, many of them grew rich and safe and influential, three very dangerous qualifications for the proponents of a holy experiment. Before long, they were compromising in order to keep control of government, in order to save the holy experiment. They were keeping slaves, and fitting ships for commerce, even for commerce in their fellow men.

But the holy experiment could not be saved by compromise. Soon they had begun to love their compromise with the fleshpots and excitements of an opening economy. By 1756, they had to withdraw from the Assembly of Pennsylvania or give up even their peace testimony. Their lives and their testimony were no longer organically related. They were trying to maintain a testimony that had lost its basis in the whole Quaker way of life, its economic basis, its social and political basis. The testimony had become a precious tradition rather than a living effect of experience.

At this same time, a small number of ministers within the Society of Friends were crying like voices in the wilderness against the patchwork character of the Quaker witness. Slavery was the head and forefront of the trouble, the most conspicuous blemish. But if we read the records that John Woolman and his co-workers have left of the concerns they voiced in their incessant travels in the ministry, or Anthony Benezet's almost desperate appeals for help in the multitudinous works of mercy he engaged in, we find that there were many items in the category of blemishes. There was love of wealth; there was love of fine appearance and property. There was what is more treacherous: love of status. There were concerns to leave wealth to one's children and to transmit one's achieved status to them. There was an easy assumption that one's own children and the children of one's peers were entitled to more advantage than the children of other groups, this in spite of the briefness of the time that had elapsed since some of these Quaker aristocrats had come to Pennsylvania as children of England's poor.

In John Woolman at least, we find a prophetic realization that the whole burgeoning economy was being built on the gratification of men's

ambition, and self-esteem, and on self-indulgence; and that such gratification leads not to human welfare but to deterioration. There was a struggle for power going on, and Friends who used no swords or guns were using the power of money and property, and the prestige based on these.

We often glory in the fact that John Woolman and his co-workers succeeded in clearing the Society of Friends of the blot of slavery nearly a hundred years before slavery as an American institution was abolished. We forget that slavery was but a part of the system they cried out against, and that in the rest of their contention they failed to move the Society of Friends.

They failed to revive the radical social philosophy that belonged to the central revelation of Quaker Christianity. That radical philosophy would subside during the period when the Society was like a walled city, and would gradually merge into individual and collective philanthropy.

We congratulate ourselves also upon the fact that no official statement of any body of Friends has ever contradicted the Peace Declaration of 1660: "...the spirit of Christ...is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil and again to move unto it, and...will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of this world."¹¹ There has been no official contradiction. But have not our lives contradicted it? We know well that, whatever may have been the case in 1660, war is not now made, nor violence exerted, only with visible weapons. Does not our whole attitude toward our place in society belie "the three Quaker principles: equality, simplicity, and peace [harmony]?"¹²

Let us look now not at the banners we hang out to declare our testimony to these principles, but at the working of the principles in our actual, daily individual lives, our lives as parents, as teachers, or so on.

Equality. We agree with the Constitution that all men are created equal, not equal in gifts and capacity but with equal right to opportunity and nurture, equal before God. Yet we Friends maintain, and if we possibly can we send our children to, schools and colleges which work on the assumption that the most expense and the best care is to be lavished on those young humans who need it least, *i.e.*, the naturally gifted and the socially privileged. Friends are thought to have a genius for education, and from the early years of the Society have had a concern to see their children and other children taught "whatsoever things were civil and useful in the creation,"¹³ Why has not that genius and that concern brought us to grips in our day with the

problem of the many persons who are not by nature equipped to deal with the demands of a modern "good" education?

Some are ill-equipped mentally, some physically, some psychologically. Very great strains of all three kinds are put upon the young organism by our modern education for "success." Our Quaker schools frankly screen out those who are unfit for such strains. And such screening is merciful. But whose job is it to nurture this screened-out group? Studies show it comprising one-third to one-half of the persons born in our country.

Do we believe in equality so long as we write off the unfitted, leaving them to the miseries of joblessness, and the approbrium of perpetual public relief? We reject a whole sector of our population as ineligible, and then label it delinquent. Is it indeed fair to say that part of the human race is unfitted for modern culture? Is it not truer to say that modern culture has unfitted the world for the use and happiness of the human race? Can a culture endure which uses only a fraction of its people?

We have renounced or outgrown the conception of an aristocracy of class or fortune, such as even Penn and Barclay accepted, but we have conceived in its place an aristocracy of intellect. It goes to the heart to see that even in our effort to erase racial inequalities, we make capital of the fact that in all races, the percentage of those fitted for success is about the same.

Simplicity. What is simplicity? Friends have loved to think it consists in "sitting loose" to one's possessions and privileges. We have loved to think that one could take one's ease in Zion, while half the human race went hungry, and still keep the simplicity banner flying, so long as one was "unattached" to this ease, this opportunity, this environment of beauty and grace. I have heard persons say: "I enjoy all this, but it doesn't mean anything to me, I could give it up tomorrow if I saw the need to, or was forced to by changed conditions." What makes them think they could?

We smile with something like superiority at our 18th and 19th century Quakers who laid up fortunes, lived in great houses, had servants and fine clothes, but had it all plain and undecorated, and so believed they practiced simplicity. Are we simpler than they? Our insurances versus their ships and acres; our variety and rapid changes of clothing and furniture versus their fine quality; our household machines versus their servants; our houses plus cars plus ready access to cultural facilities versus their solid home-comforts — the scales stand nearly level. They might smile as tolerantly at our "simplicity" as we at theirs.

John Woolman thought that simplicity was "to turn all that we possess into the channel of universal love," and that it was to become "the whole business of our lives." Have we Friends living in this second half of the twentieth century ever made it "the whole business of our lives"?

There is a simplicity that has nothing to do with goods and chattels; it may have them or not and it does not know the difference, but goods and chattels seldom accumulate where this simplicity reigns. There is a stewardship or trusteeship that holds wealth in trust for the less competent, but it does not luxuriate while its wards live on the verge of want. "Unattachment" and "stewardship" are words to be wary of.

Hard as is simplicity's struggle to survive amid goods and chattels, perhaps even harder is its struggle to maintain itself amid bustle and busyness. Thrift used to be a virtue; we rather laugh at the virtue of thrift now (the national economy does not thrive on thrift), but for us the equivalent virtue is *time-saving*. "I'm wearing six hats," a young man said to me the other day, not at all deprecatingly, as he snatched them off and on at bewildering speed. Few of us have the simplicity of heart to allow ourselves to have (while in health), or to admit that we have (if we do), some times of real mental, physical, and spiritual leisure. Yet perhaps simplicity perishes without such leisure: time to attend, to wait, to look. Simone Weil simplified the definition of religion to "nothing else but a looking." "What," says the *Imitation of Christ*, "can be more quiet than the single eye?" Simplicity is singleness of eye, of heart, of will: "Purity of heart is to will one thing." But to will one thing and to wish for a multiplicity of things make a contradiction in which there can be no simplicity. Simplicity abhors contradiction between inward and outward, as much as nature abhors a vacuum.

Harmony. What about harmony? We usually call it the Peace Testimony, but harmony is the ground; peace is the tree which rises from this ground. Too often we let ourselves suppose that peace can be organized over seething disharmony, as a lid can be clamped on a boiling pot, if only we can find the lid that fits and the right clamps. I do not for a moment want to seem to undervalue the instruments of war prevention, the United Nations, the Test Ban Treaty, the various international agreements. But they can be dangerous if they induce a euphoria in which we forget that they are props set against a structure in which the fundamentals of harmonious stability are missing.

Our witness to the power of non-violence is verbal and not visceral — it is sentimental — so long as we acquiesce in the use of violence on

our behalf, so long as we tacitly agree for the utmost (or even a minimal) potential violence to be held in reserve for our "defense," so long as we consent to be, and even study to become, the darlings of an economy that is built on the threat and preparation of war.

We Friends want to be pacifist without being radical; to stand for peace but not for the deep changes in the fabric of personal and interpersonal life, of national and international habits, that must provide the ground for organic rather than organized peace. Richard Gregg, exploring the roots of non-violence, recently wrote:

I am trying to see the connection between conduct or morality and Jesus' statement that...we must deny ourselves. Not just deny some pleasure to ourselves, but deny the very existence of our lesser selves. Jesus would not have asked us to deny something that is real. So I think he was agreeing with Buddha who said outright that the self is not real but a fiction. The churches refuse to accept these words of Jesus, and assert just the contrary, and our whole culture exalts ambition and "success" and greed and other aspects of self-assertion.¹⁴

We are really in a double bind with our testimonies. We don't want to help our country pay for the machines of war, but even less do we want to go through the confusion and opprobrium and even suffering that refusing to comply with tax laws might bring on us. We don't really want to profit from industry that battens on armament and luxury, but everything is linked together so inextricably that we do not know how to keep free of it unless we deprive ourselves of the standard of living that is standard for middle class Americans. We do not really want to educate our children to strive for the prizes of a world that is in plain contradiction with Truth, but we have not the courage to leave them unprepared to compete in a world they must live in.

Besides, we have so much important work in hand, work that reaches into far corners of the earth dispensing help and cheer, work that opposes war and other evils, work that encourages trends toward betterment — what would become of our work if we impoverished ourselves or got into serious trouble with the law, or gave up competing for success. Surely our work is our witness. But is it?

But is it? When George Fox and Edward Pyott were in Launceston jail in 1656 for refusing compliance with laws that infringed their consciences, their work was at a standstill. Trouble was brewing in London within the large and inexperienced group of new Quakers. And there sat George Fox in jail. He says in his *Journal*:

There came up Humphrey Lower, a grave, sober, ancient man, a justice of the peace, to visit us. And he was very sorry we should be in prison and... said how serviceable we might be if we were out of prison; and we reasoned with him [that] no people could be serviceable to God if they disobeyed the command of Christ.¹⁵

It is not the relevance of our testimonies as stated in the various Books of Discipline that we need to question. The threefold Quaker program of equality, simplicity, and harmony is more relevant to human need than ever before in history. But testimony that springs in a human conviction, and is an implement of that conviction, points two ways. It directs itself not only toward the condition it speaks to, but also back to the life of the person speaking it. Unless our witness is as relevant to the lives we are presently living as it is to the universal need it speaks to, unless it is rooted and alive in the ground of our experience, it is a dead tradition, a clanging cymbal, a flapping banner.

Now may be the moment, as Buber calls it, of our "genuine responsibility," both to our own Society of Friends and to society at large, the moment "...in which the demander demands of me the entrusted good, and I must open my hands or they petrify."¹⁶

REFERENCES

¹John Woolman, *On Loving Our Neighbors as Ourselves*.

²William Blake, *The Four Zoas*, ii.

³Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History*, Abridgement by D. C. Somervell.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 398-9.

⁵W. C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, quoted by Hugh Doncaster in the 1963 Swarthmore Lecture, *God in Every Man*.

⁶*The Friend*, October 4, 1963, p. 1142.

⁷Northrop Frye, *Fearful Symmetry*, p. 71.

⁸Joseph Hoag, *Journal*, 1860 ed., p. 203.

⁹David Masson, *The Life of Milton in Connection with his Time*, vi, 587-8; based on Barclay's *Apology*, Prop. XIV, Article vi.

¹⁰Frederick Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House*, p. 63.

¹¹George Fox, *Journal*, Nickalls ed., p. 399.

¹²Frederick Tolles, *op. cit.* This is a revision of Howard Brinton's "fourfold program" of harmony, simplicity, community and equality.

¹³George Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 520.

¹⁴Richard Gregg in *Manas*.

¹⁵George Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

¹⁶Martin Buber, "The Question to the Single One" in *Between Man and Man*, p. 46.



NOTES FROM HERE AND THERE

COMING EVENTS

— PRE-YEARLY MEETING RETREAT. A silent retreat will be held just prior to 1965 Pacific Yearly Meeting, beginning at 8 p.m. on August 12, and concluding after lunch on August 13, at the White Memorial Retreat in Mill Valley, Calif. Cost of \$7.50 includes overnight accommodation, breakfast, and lunch. Participation is limited to fifteen, and the first who apply will be accepted. Registration of \$2.00 (not returnable after June 1) should be sent to Gretchen Rudnick, 405 Vincente Way, La Jolla, California.

— WILLAMETTE QUARTERLY MEETING will be held in Portland, Oregon on May 8, with Multnomah Meeting serving as host. Young Friends Half-Yearly Meeting will be held on May 8-9 at the Catlin Gabel School. A Quarterly Meeting Retreat is planned for late May or early June.

BIRTHS

— On February 23, to SALLY and HUGH BURGESS (Honolulu Meeting), a son, Alexander Courtney.

— On February 16, to MARJORIE and DELMORE HUSERIK (Los Angeles Meeting), a son, Trevor Delmore.

MARRIAGES

— On March 6, BETTY MOULUN and JOSEPH STOKES (Honolulu Meeting). The couple will live in La Jolla, Calif.

— On March 7, PAMELA RUBEN and BOB MANG (San Francisco Meeting). He is on the staff of the Northern California Friends Committee on Legislation.

TEENAGE FRIENDS ADVENTURE TO MEXICO — Among past participants have been PYM Young Friends from Arizona, California, Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia. Coed camping, "roughing it" — seeking the heart of the country and the hearts of the people. Ken Stevens, R8-3473 California, Modesto, California. —Adv.

— On April 17, JOEL MERMIN and ELLEN THOMAS (Berkeley Meeting), daughter of John and Frances Thomas. They will be living in Clinton, N. Y., where he will start teaching at Hamilton College this fall.

— On April 15, CELESTE WELSH (Phoenix Meeting) and GEORGE JOHNSON, at the First Baptist Church in Tempe.

NEWS OF MEETINGS

— UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA FRIENDS, in conjunction with the Portland AFSC office, arranged a student seminar on "Non-Violence and Power Politics" on the weekend of February 12-14. David McReynolds of the War Resisters League, and several UBC professors, were the speakers. Besides students from the University, about twenty students from Portland and Seattle participated.

— SKAGIT-WHATCOM ALLOWED MEETING has lost its valued member, LOUIS TABER, who has moved back to the Midwest. New correspondent for this group is CHARLES LUDWIG, 437 - 15th St., Bellingham, Washington.

NEWS OF FRIENDS

— PETER GULBRANDSEN (Berkeley Meeting) has received a Federal appointment as Danish, Norwegian and Swedish translator in San Francisco.

— ANNE HAY (Multnomah Meeting) and children left on February 28 to join her husband in Nigeria, where he is serving as AID economic advisor to the University of Nigeria.

— JANE HURN (Phoenix Meeting) has won a scholarship to Earlham College, and will join her sister Paula there this fall.

— ELLIS JUMP (Multnomah Meeting) has been elected to the permanent committee for the War on Poverty in his area of Portland.

— JAMES NEWTON (Phoenix Meeting), a student at Dartmouth, has been named President-elect of the National Young Scientists of America.

CUSTODIAN (Couple or single) and HOST/HOESSESS (Quaker) wanted immediately for San Francisco Friends Center. Live in. Write S. F. Meeting, 2160 Lake Street, San Francisco, California 94121. —Adv.

Robert and Marie Schutz
1304 Acton Street
Berkeley, Calif. 94706